arXiv:1401.7797v1 [math.RA] 30 Jan 2014

ON WEIGHTED REVERSE ORDER LAWS FOR THE MOORE-PENROSE INVERSE AND K-INVERSES

Enrico Boasso, Dragana S. Cvetković-Ilić and Robin Harte

Abstract

The main objective of this article is to study several generalizations of the reverse order law for the Moore-Penrose inverse in ring with involution.

Keywords: Moore-Penrose inverse, K-inverse, reverse order law, ring with involution, prime ring.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 15A09.

1. Introduction

Given a complex matrix a, the Moore-Penrose inverse of a is the unique complex matrix b satisfying the following *Penrose equations* (Penrose (1955)):

$$(1)\ a = aba, \qquad (2)\ b = bab, \qquad (3)\ (ab)^* = ab, \qquad (4)\ (ba)^* = ba.$$

This generalization of the inverse of a non-singular square matrix was first introduced by E. H. Moore, but remained unknown mainly because of Moore's special notation (see Moore (1920)). The equations (1)-(4) were formulated by Penrose, and they characterize the same object considered by E. H. Moore.

T. N. Greville first characterized when the product of two complex matrices a and b satisfies the so-called *reverse order law* for the Moore-Penrose inverse, that is when

$$(ab)^\dagger = b^\dagger a^\dagger,$$

where $c^\dagger$ denotes the Moore-Penrose of a complex matrix c (Greville (1966)); note that the proofs in Greville (1966) remain valid for pairs a, b of Moore-Penrose invertible C^*-algebra elements whose product ab also has a Moore-Penrose inverse. In this context, in Boasso (2006) several other conditions equivalent to the reverse order law for the Moore-Penrose inverse were proved.

In the framework of rings with involution, J. J. Koliha, D. S. Djordjević and D. S. Cvetković extended the characterization in Greville (1966) under the additional assumption of the $*$-left cancellation property of a particular element of the ring (Koliha, Djordjević, Cvetković (2007)).

The first objective of the present article is to study the following generalization of the reverse order law for the Moore-Penrose inverse: given a ring with involution $\mathcal{R}$, elements in $\mathcal{R}$ for which a, b and ab are Moore-Penrose invertible, and an element $c \in \mathcal{R}$ which commutes with b and b^*, characterize when the following identity holds:

$$(ab)^\dagger = cb^\dagger a^\dagger.$$

This identity and others presented in section 2 will be called *weighted reverse order laws* for the Moore-Penrose inverse.

Naturally, when $c = e$ a characterization of the usual reverse order law is obtained. Furthermore, other similar generalizations of the reverse order law for the Moore-Penrose inverse in rings with involution and in complex algebras with involution will be also considered, see next section. Note that no additional assumption such as the $*$-cancellation property for elements of the ring is needed.

On the other hand, given a C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$, an element $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and a subset $K \subseteq \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, an element $x \in \mathcal{A}$ is said to be a *K-inverse of a*, if x satisfies the Penrose equation (j) for each $j \in K$. Several reverse order laws for K-inverses of products of two C^*-algebra elements were characterized by D. S. Cvetković-Ilić and R. E. Harte. The second objective of this work is to extend some of the results in Cvetković-Ilić, Harte (2011) to weighted reverse order laws in rings with involution, see section 3.

Before going on, several definitions and some notation will be recalled.

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be an associative ring with unit element e. The ring $\mathcal{R}$ is said to be a *prime ring*, if whenever elements a and $b \in \mathcal{R}$ satisfy $a\mathcal{R}b = \{0\}$, then $0 \in \{a, b\}$ (see McCoy (1949)). For example, given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the ring of square matrices $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ is prime, see Lemma 3 in Baksalary, Baksalary (2005). It is not difficult to prove that the same is true when $\mathcal{A} \subseteq L(X)$ is a subalgebra of the Banach algebra of all bounded operators defined on the Banach space X which contains the ideal of finite rank operators. In the case of general Banach algebras, prime, ultraprime and spectrally prime algebras were considered in Harte, Hernández (1998).

An element $a \in \mathcal{R}$ is said to be *group invertible* if there exists $b \in \mathcal{R}$ such that

$$aba = a, \qquad bab = b, \qquad ab = ba.$$

It is well known that if $a \in \mathcal{R}$ is group invertible, then there is only one group inverse of a (Mosić, Djordjević (2009)), which will be denoted by $a^\sharp$.

An involution $^*\colon \mathcal{R} \to \mathcal{R}$ is an anti-isomorphism of degree 2, that is

$$(a^*)^* = a, \qquad (a + b)^* = a^* + b^*, \qquad (ab)^* = b^*a^*.$$

Given $\mathcal{R}$ a ring with involution, an element $a \in \mathcal{R}$ is said to be *Hermitian* if $a = a^*$, and a is said to be *Moore-Penrose invertible* if there exists $b \in \mathcal{R}$ such that a and b satisfy the Penrose equations presented above.

It is well known that given $a \in \mathcal{R}$, there is at most one Moore-Penrose inverse of a, see Roch, Silbermann (1999). When the Moore-Penrose inverse of $a \in \mathcal{R}$ exists, it will be denoted, as before, by $a^\dagger$. In addition, $\mathcal{R}^\dagger$ will stand for the set of all Moore-Penrose invertible elements of $a \in \mathcal{R}$. Note that if $a \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$, then $aa^\dagger$ and $a^\dagger a$ are hermitian idempotents. What is more, if $a \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$, then $a^\dagger \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ and $(a^\dagger)^\dagger = a$. Moreover, it is easy to prove that $a \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ if

and only if $a^* \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$. Furthermore, in this case, $(a^*)^\dagger = (a^\dagger)^*$. In what follows $(a^\dagger)^*$ will be denoted by $a^{\dagger *}$.

Given $a \in \mathcal{R}$ and $K \subseteq \{1,2,3,4\}$, $x \in \mathcal{R}$ will be said to be a *K-inverse of a*, if x satisfies the same condition recalled above for C^*-algebra elements. The set of all K-inverses of a given $a \in \mathcal{R}$ will be denoted by aK.

Finally, if p and q are idempotents in $\mathcal{R}$, then an arbitrary $x \in \mathcal{R}$ can be represented as a 2×2 matrix over $\mathcal{R}$; specifically

$$x = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 \\ x_3 & x_4 \end{bmatrix}_{p,q},$$

where $x_1 = pxq$, $x_2 = px(e-q)$, $x_3 = (e-p)xq$ and $x_4 = (e-p)x(e-q)$. Note that $x = x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4$.

2. Weighted reverse order laws for the Moore-Penrose inverse

We begin by presenting an equivalent formulation for the Moore-Penrose inverse. Although its proof is not difficult (Penrose (1955)), it will be used below, and hence we reproduce it here.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a ring with involution and consider $a \in \mathcal{R}$. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*
(i) $b \in \mathcal{R}$ is the Moore-Penrose inverse of a;
(ii) $a = aa^*b^*$ and $b^* = abb^*$.

Proof. If $b = a^\dagger$ then, since $(ab)^* = ab$,

$$a = aba = a(ba) = a(ba)^* = aa^*b^*, \qquad b^* = (bab)^* = (ab)^*b^* = abb^*.$$

On the other hand, if statement (ii) holds, then

$$ba = baa^*b^* = ba(ba)^*, \qquad (ab)^* = b^*a^* = abb^*a^* = ab(ab)^*,$$

equivalently, ab and ba are hermitian idempotents. However, according to statement (ii),

$$a = a(ba)^* = aba, \qquad b = b(ab)^* = bab.$$

□

The following proposition will extend to rings with involution a well known result concerning the Moore-Penrose inverse of $\mathbb{C}^*$-algebra elements, see Theorem 7 in Harte, Mbekhta (1992).

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a ring with involution and consider $a \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ and $c \in \mathcal{R}$. Necessary and sufficient condition for c to commute with a and a^* is that c commutes with $a^\dagger$ and $a^{\dagger *}$.*

Proof. Let $a \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$. Then, according to Theorem 5.3 in Koliha, Patrício (2002), $(a^*a)^\sharp$ exists. Moreover,

$$a^\dagger = (a^*a)^\sharp a^*.$$

If c commutes with a and a^*, then c commutes with a^*a. In addition, since a^*a is group invertible, c commutes with $(a^*a)^\sharp$, see Mosić, Djordjević (2009). Therefore c commutes with $a^\dagger = (a^*a)^\sharp a^*$.

In addition, since $a^* \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ and $(a^*)^* = a$, according to what has been proved, c commutes with $(a^*)^\dagger = a^{\dagger *}$.

On the other hand, if c commutes with $a^\dagger$ and $a^{\dagger *}$, then since $(a^\dagger)^\dagger = a$ and $(a^\dagger)^{\dagger *} = a^*$, c commutes with a and a^*. □

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a ring with involution and consider $a, b \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$. Define

$$p = bb^\dagger, \quad q = a^\dagger a^{\dagger *}, \quad r = bb^*, \quad s = a^\dagger a.$$

Clearly p, q, r and s are hermitian elements. Moreover, according to Proposition 2.1,

$$a = as, \quad a^{\dagger *} = aq, \quad b = rb^{\dagger *}, \quad b^{\dagger *} = pb^{\dagger *}.$$

Note that p, q, r and s are blanket notations for this section.

In the following theorems several weighted reverse order laws for the Moore-Penrose inverse will be presented. Note that when $c = e$, then a characterization of the usual reverse order law in rings with involution is obtained.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a ring with involution. Consider $a, b \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ such that $ab \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$, and $c \in \mathcal{R}$ such that c commutes with b and b^*. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*
(i) $(ab)^\dagger = cb^\dagger a^\dagger$;
(ii) $a(cpq - qp)b^{\dagger *}c^* = 0$ and $a(rsc^* - sr)b^{\dagger *} = 0$;
(iii) $scpqpc^* = qpc^*$ and $srspc^* = sr$.

Proof. In first place, note that according to Proposition 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned} &a = aa^*a^{\dagger *}, && b = bb^*b^{\dagger *}, && ab = ab(ab)^*(ab)^{\dagger *}, \\ &a^{\dagger *} = aa^\dagger a^{\dagger *}, && b^{\dagger *} = bb^\dagger b^{\dagger *}, && (ab)^{\dagger *} = ab(ab)^\dagger (ab)^{\dagger *}. \end{aligned}$$

(i) ⇒ (ii). Suppose that $(ab)^\dagger = cb^\dagger a^\dagger$. Then, since $(ab)^* = b^*a^*$ and $(ab)^{\dagger *} = (cb^\dagger a^\dagger)^* = a^{\dagger *}b^{\dagger *}c^*$,

$$ab = abb^*a^*a^{\dagger *}b^{\dagger *}c^*, \qquad a^{\dagger *}b^{\dagger *}c^* = abcb^\dagger a^\dagger a^{\dagger *}b^{\dagger *}c^*,$$

which, since c and b commute, can be written as

$$asrb^{\dagger *} = arsb^{\dagger *}c^*, \qquad aqpb^{\dagger *}c^* = acpqb^{\dagger *}c^*.$$

However, according to Proposition 2.2 these identities are equivalent to

$$a(cpq - qp)b^{\dagger *}c^* = 0, \qquad a(rsc^* - sr)b^{\dagger *} = 0.$$

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii). If the second statement holds, then

$$a^\dagger acpqb^{\dagger *}c^*b^* = a^\dagger aqpb^{\dagger *}c^*b^*, \qquad a^\dagger arsc^*b^{\dagger *}b^* = a^\dagger asrb^{\dagger *}b^*.$$

However, since c commutes with b and $b^\dagger$,

$$a^\dagger acpqb^{\dagger *}b^*c^* = a^\dagger aqpb^{\dagger *}b^*c^*, \qquad a^\dagger arsb^{\dagger *}b^*c^* = a^\dagger asrb^{\dagger *}b^*.$$

What is more, according again to Proposition 2.1 and to the fact that $s = s^*$ and $p = p^*$, these equations can be rewritten as

$$scpqpc^* = a^\dagger(aa^\dagger a^{\dagger *})b(b^\dagger b^{\dagger *}b^*)c^* = a^\dagger a^{\dagger *}bb^\dagger c^* = qpc^*,$$

$$srspc^* = (a^\dagger aa^*)a^{\dagger *}(bb^*b^{\dagger *})b^* = a^*a^{\dagger *}bb^* = sr.$$

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i). Suppose that statement (iii) holds. Then, since $p = p^*$, $s = s^*$ and b and c commute,

$$a^\dagger abcb^\dagger a^\dagger a^{\dagger *}b^{\dagger *}b^*c^* = a^\dagger a^{\dagger *}bb^\dagger c^*,$$
$$a^\dagger abb^*a^*a^{\dagger *}b^{\dagger *}b^*c^* = a^*a^{\dagger *}bb^*.$$

Moreover, since c and $b^\dagger$ commute,

$$(aa^\dagger a)bcb^\dagger a^\dagger a^{\dagger *}(b^{\dagger *}b^*b^{\dagger *})c^* = (aa^\dagger a^{\dagger *})(bb^\dagger b^{\dagger *})c^*,$$

$$(aa^\dagger a)bb^*a^*a^{\dagger *}(b^{\dagger *}b^*b^{\dagger *})c^* = (aa^*a^{\dagger *})(bb^*b^{\dagger *}).$$

However, according to Proposition 2.1, these equations are equivalent to

$$ab(cb^\dagger a^\dagger)(cb^\dagger a^\dagger)^* = (cb^\dagger a^\dagger)^*,$$

$$ab(ab)^*(cb^\dagger a^\dagger)^* = ab.$$

Therefore,

$$(ab)^\dagger = cb^\dagger a^\dagger.$$

□

As an application of Theorem 2.3, other generalizations of the reverse order law can be characterized.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a ring with involution. Consider $a, b \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ such that $ab \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$, and $c \in \mathcal{R}$ such that c commutes with a and a^*. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*
(i) $(ab)^\dagger = b^\dagger a^\dagger c$;
(ii) $b^*(c^*sr^\dagger - r^\dagger s)a^\dagger c = 0$ and $b^*(q^\dagger pc - pq^\dagger)a^\dagger = 0$;
(iii) $pc^*sr^\dagger sc = r^\dagger sc$ and $pq^\dagger psc = pq^\dagger$.

Proof. Recall that given $h \in \mathcal{R}$, necessary and sufficient for h to belong to $\mathcal{R}^\dagger$ is that $h^* \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$, (see Theorem 5.4 in Koliha, Patrício (2002)). Moreover, in this case $(h^*)^\dagger = (h^\dagger)^*$. It is not difficult to prove that the identity $(ab)^\dagger = b^\dagger a^\dagger c$ is equivalent to

$$(b^*a^*)^\dagger = c^*(a^*)^\dagger(b^*)^\dagger.$$

On the other hand, denote by p_1, q_1, r_1 and s_1 the elements of $\mathcal{R}$ corresponding to p, q, r and s defined using b^*a^* instead of ab. Then, it is easy to prove that

$$p_1 = s, \qquad s_1 = p.$$

In addition, according to the proof of Theorem 5.3 in Koliha, Patrício (2002),

$$q_1 = r^\dagger, \qquad r_1 = q^\dagger.$$

To conclude the proof, apply Theorem 2.3 to b^*, a^*, b^*a^* and c^* in place of a, b, ab and c. □

Theorem 2.5. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a ring with involution. Consider $a, b \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ and $c \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $cab \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$. Then, if c commutes with a and a^*, the following statements are equivalent:*
(i) $(cab)^\dagger = b^\dagger a^\dagger$;
(ii) $b^\dagger(csr - rs)a^*c^* = 0$ and $b^\dagger(qpc^* - pq)a^* = 0$;
(iii) $pcsrsc^* = rsc^*$ and $pqpsc^* = pq$.

Proof. Note that $cab \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ and $(cab)^\dagger = b^\dagger a^\dagger$ if and only if $b^\dagger a^\dagger \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ and $(b^\dagger a^\dagger)^\dagger = cab$.

As in the proof of Theorem 2.4, p_2, q_2, r_2 and s_2 denote the elements of $\mathcal{R}$ corresponding to p, q, r and s defined using $b^\dagger a^\dagger$ instead of ab. Then, it is easy to prove that

$$p_2 = s, \quad q_2 = r, \quad r_2 = q, \quad s_2 = p.$$

To conclude the proof, apply Theorem 2.3 to $b^\dagger$, $a^\dagger$, $b^\dagger a^\dagger$ and c in place of a, b, ab and c. □

Theorem 2.6. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a ring with involution. Consider $a, b \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ and $c \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $abc \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$. Then, if c commutes with b and b^*, the following statements are equivalent:*
(i) $(abc)^\dagger = b^\dagger a^\dagger$;
(ii) $a^{\dagger *}(c^*pq^\dagger - q^\dagger p)bc = 0$ and $a^{\dagger *}(r^\dagger sc - sr^\dagger)b = 0$;
(iii) $sc^*pq^\dagger pc = q^\dagger pc$ and $sr^\dagger spc = sr^\dagger$.

Proof. It is easy to prove that the first statement is equivalent to

$$(a^{\dagger *}b^{\dagger *})^\dagger = c^*b^*a^*.$$

As in Theorem 2.4 and Theorem 2.5, denote by p_3, q_3, r_3 and s_3 the elements of $\mathcal{R}$ corresponding to p, q, r and s defined using $a^{\dagger *}b^{\dagger *}$ instead of ab. Then, using the proof of Theorem 5.3 in Koliha, Patrício (2002), we prove that

$$p_3 = p, \quad q_3 = q^\dagger, \quad r_3 = r^\dagger, \quad s_3 = s.$$

To conclude the proof, apply Theorem 2.3 to $a^{\dagger *}$, $b^{\dagger *}$, $a^{\dagger *}b^{\dagger *}$ and c^* in place of a, b, ab and c. □

Specializing to the case of an algebra with involution over the complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$ ($\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{A}$), $\overline{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}$ will stand for the *complex conjugate* of $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Note that $(\lambda a)^* = \overline{\lambda} a^*$ for any a in the algebra. In particular we can now allow the element $c \in \mathcal{A}$ be a scalar multiple of the identity, i.e., $c = \lambda e$.

Corollary 2.7. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an algebra with involution over $\mathbb{C}$. Consider $a, b \in \mathcal{A}^\dagger$ such that $ab \in \mathcal{A}^\dagger$, and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*
(i) $(ab)^\dagger = \lambda b^\dagger a^\dagger$;
(ii) $a(\lambda pq - qp)b^{\dagger *} = 0$ and $a(rs\overline{\lambda} - sr)b^{\dagger *} = 0$;
(iii) $\lambda spqp = qp$ and $\overline{\lambda} srsp = sr$.

Proof. Apply Theorem 2.3. □

Remark 2.8. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a C^*-algebra and consider $a, b \in \mathcal{A}^\dagger$ such that $ab \in \mathcal{A}^\dagger$. Let p, q, r and s be the elements of $\mathcal{A}$ defined before Theorem 2.3. Recall that, according to Remark 3.5 in Boasso (2006) or Greville (1966), $(ab)^\dagger = b^\dagger a^\dagger$ if and only if $rs = sr$ and $pq = qp$. Note that according to Theorem 7 in Harte, Mbekhta (1992), p and q commute (respectively r and s commute) if and only if p and $q^\dagger$ commute (respectively s and $r^\dagger$ commute). What is more, these statements are equivalent to the at first sight weaker conditions of Theorems 3.1-3.4 in Boasso (2006).

When $\mathcal{R}$ a ring with involution, $a, b \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ and $(e - a^\dagger a)b$ is left $*$-cancellable, necessary and sufficient for ab to belong to $\mathcal{R}^\dagger$ and $(ab)^\dagger = b^\dagger a^\dagger$ is that $rs = sr$ and $pq^\dagger = q^\dagger p$ (see Theorem 3 in Koliha, Djordjević, Cvetković (2007)). Note also that according to Proposition 2.2, p and q commute (respectively r and s commute) if and only if p and $q^\dagger$ commute (respectively s and $r^\dagger$ commute). Therefore, considering $c = e$, the conditions presented in Theorem 2.3 are weaker than the ones in Theorem 3 in Koliha, Djordjević, Cvetković (2007) and to prove them the cancellation property is not necessary. In particular, while all the aforementioned results are equivalent in C^*-algebras, in the case of rings with involution, according to the characterization of Theorem 2.3, if the reverse order law is satisfied by a and b, the identities $rs = sr$ and $pq^\dagger = q^\dagger p$ need not to be satisfied. According to Theorem 3 in Koliha, Djordjević, Cvetković (2007), these equalities are satisfied when the cancellation property is assumed.

3. Weighted reverse order laws for K-inverses in prime rings

In this section, $\mathcal{R}$ will be a prime ring with involution and $K \subseteq \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. For $a, b \in \mathcal{R}$, several weighted reverse order laws for K-inverses of ab will be characterized. First we will present some preliminary facts.

Remark 3.1. Consider $a, b \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ and $c \in \mathcal{R}$ such that c commutes with a and a^*. Let $p = bb^\dagger$, $q = b^\dagger b$ and $r = aa^\dagger$. We have that $b = \begin{bmatrix} b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}_{p,q}$ and $a = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 & a_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}_{r,p}$. An arbitrary $b^{(1,3)} \in b\{1,3\}$ has the form $b^{(1,3)} = \begin{bmatrix} b^\dagger & 0 \\ u & v \end{bmatrix}_{q,p}$, for some $u \in (e-q)\mathcal{A}p$ and $v \in (e-q)\mathcal{A}(e-p)$, and an arbitrary $a^{(1,3)}$ has the form $a^{(1,3)} = a^\dagger + (e - a^\dagger a)x$, for some $x = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 \\ x_3 & x_4 \end{bmatrix}_{p,r} \in \mathcal{R}$, i.e., $a^{(1,3)} = \begin{bmatrix} z_1 & z_2 \\ z_3 & z_4 \end{bmatrix}_{p,r}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} z_1 &= a_1^* d^\dagger + (e - a_1^* d^\dagger a_1)x_1 - a_1^* d^\dagger a_2 x_3, \\ z_2 &= (e - a_1^* d^\dagger a_1)x_2 - a_1^* d^\dagger a_2 x_4, \\ z_3 &= a_2^* d^\dagger - a_2^* d^\dagger a_1 x_1 + (e - a_2^* d^\dagger a_2)x_3, \\ z_4 &= -a_2^* d^\dagger a_1 x_2 + (e - a_2^* d^\dagger a_2)x_4. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Also, $a^\dagger = a^*(aa^*)^\dagger = \begin{bmatrix} a_1^* d^\dagger & 0 \\ a_2^* d^\dagger & 0 \end{bmatrix}_{p,r}$ (Theorem 5.3 in Koliha, Patrício (2002)) where $d = aa^* = a_1 a_1^* + a_2 a_2^*$ and $d^\dagger = (aa^*)^\dagger$.

If c commutes with a and a^*, it follows that $c = \begin{bmatrix} c_1 & 0 \\ 0 & c_2 \end{bmatrix}_{r,r}$.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a prime ring with involution. Consider $a, b \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ and $c \in \mathcal{R}$ such that c commutes with a and a^*. Then, following statements are equivalent:*

(i) $b\{1,3\} \cdot a\{1,3\} \cdot c \subseteq (ab)\{1,3\}$;

(ii) $b^\dagger a^\dagger c \in ab\{1,3\}$, $b^\dagger a^\dagger \in ab\{1\}$ *and* $a^\dagger \in a(e - bb^\dagger)\{1\}$.

Proof. Note that the case $ab = 0$ is trivial. Hence, we will consider the case $ab \neq 0$.

Clearly $b\{1,3\} \cdot a\{1,3\} \cdot c \subseteq (ab)\{1,3\}$ is equivalent to the fact that for any $a^{(1,3)} \in a\{1,3\}$ and any $b^{(1,3)} \in b\{1,3\}$:

$$b^{(1,3)} a^{(1,3)} c \in (ab)\{1,3\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Using the matrix representations considered in Remark 3.1, we have that (3.2) is equivalent to

$$\text{(i) } a_1 z_1 c_1 a_1 = a_1, \qquad \text{(ii) } a_1 z_2 c_2 = 0, \qquad \text{(iii) } (a_1 z_1 c_1)^* = a_1 z_1 c_1, \tag{3.3}$$

where z_1 and z_2 are defined by (3.1). Now, using (3.1), the identity (3.3)(i) is equivalent to

$$a_1 a_1^* d^\dagger c_1 a_1 + (a_1 - a_1 a_1^* d^\dagger a_1) x_1 c_1 a_1 - a_1 a_1^* d^\dagger a_2 x_3 c_1 a_1 = a_1.$$

Since, x_1 and x_3 are arbitrary elements from appropriate subalgebras, (3.3)(i) is equivalent to

$$\text{(i) } a_1 a_1^* d^\dagger c_1 a_1 = a_1, \quad \text{(ii) } (a_1 - a_1 a_1^* d^\dagger a_1) x_1 c_1 a_1 = 0, \quad \text{(iii) } a_1 a_1^* d^\dagger a_2 x_3 c_1 a_1 = 0. \tag{3.4}$$

What is more, since $a_1 = rap$, $x_1 = pxr$ and $c_1 = rcr$, (3.4)(ii) is equivalent to

$$(a_1 - a_1 a_1^* d^\dagger a_1) x c_1 a_1 = 0,$$

where $x \in \mathcal{R}$ is arbitrary. However, since $\mathcal{R}$ is a prime ring, $a_1 - a_1 a_1^* d^\dagger a_1 = 0$ or $c_1 a_1 = 0$.

Similarly, from (3.4)(iii), we get that $a_1 a_1^* d^\dagger a_2 = 0$ or $c_1 a_1 = 0$.

Note that the case $c_1 a_1 = 0$ implies that $ab = 0$, which is not possible.

Therefore, $c_1 a_1 \neq 0$, and equation (3.3)(i) is equivalent to

$$\text{(i) } a_1 a_1^* d^\dagger c_1 a_1 = a_1, \qquad \text{(ii) } a_1 - a_1 a_1^* d^\dagger a_1 = 0, \qquad \text{(iii) } a_1 a_1^* d^\dagger a_2 = 0, \tag{3.5}$$

i.e.,

$$\text{(i) } b^\dagger a^\dagger c \in ab\{1\}, \qquad \text{(ii) } b^\dagger a^\dagger \in ab\{1\}, \qquad \text{(iii) } a^\dagger \in a(e-bb^\dagger)\{1\}. \tag{3.6}$$

Now, (3.5) imply that $a_1 z_2 = 0$ and the fact that $a_1 z_1 c_1 = a_1 a_1^* d^\dagger c_1$ is hermitian is equivalent to the fact that $abb^\dagger a^\dagger c$ is hermitian, i.e. $b^\dagger a^\dagger c \in ab\{3\}$. □

From the proof of Theorem 3.2 it follows that under the assumption $a_2 = a(e-bb^\dagger) \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$, condition (3.5)$(ii)$ implies condition (3.5)(iii):

$$a_1 - a_1 a_1^* d^\dagger a_1 = 0 \Rightarrow a_1 - dd^\dagger a_1 + a_2 a_2^* d^\dagger a_1 = 0 \Rightarrow a_2^* d^\dagger a_1 = 0,$$

so we get the following corollary.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a prime ring with involution. Consider $a, b \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ such that $a(e - bb^\dagger) \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ and let $c \in \mathcal{R}$ such that c commutes with a and a^*. Then, following statements are equivalent:*

(i) $b\{1,3\} \cdot a\{1,3\} \cdot c \subseteq (ab)\{1,3\}$;

(ii) $b^\dagger a^\dagger c \in ab\{1,3\}$, $b^\dagger a^\dagger \in ab\{1\}$.

In the following theorem, for given $M \subseteq \mathcal{R}$, M^* will stand for the set of all adjoint elements of M, i.e., $M^* = \{x^* \colon x \in M\}$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a prime ring with involution. Consider $a, b \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ and $c \in \mathcal{R}$ such that c commutes with b and b^*. Then, following statements are equivalent:*

(i) $c \cdot b\{1,4\} \cdot a\{1,4\} \subseteq (ab)\{1,4\}$;

(ii) $cb^\dagger a^\dagger \in ab\{1,4\}$, $b^\dagger a^\dagger \in ab\{1\}$ *and* $b^\dagger \in (e - a^\dagger a)b\{1\}$.

Proof. Note that for given $x \in \mathcal{R}$, $(x\{1,4\})^* = x^*\{1,3\}$. Therefore, the first statement is equivalent to $a^*\{1,3\} \cdot b^*\{1,3\} \cdot c^* \subseteq (b^*a^*)\{1,3\}$. Now apply Theorem 3.2. □

As in the case of Theorem 3.2, the following corollary can be deduced from Theorem 3.4.

Corollary 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a prime ring with involution. Consider $a, b \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ such that $(e - a^\dagger a)b \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ and let $c \in \mathcal{R}$ such that c commutes with b and b^*. Then, following statements are equivalent:*

(i) $c \cdot b\{1,4\} \cdot a\{1,4\} \subseteq (ab)\{1,4\}$;

(ii) $cb^\dagger a^\dagger \in ab\{1,4\}$, $b^\dagger a^\dagger \in ab\{1\}$.

Theorem 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a prime ring with involution. Consider $a, b \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ and $c \in \mathcal{R}$ such that c commutes with a and a^*. Then, following statements are equivalent:*

(i) $b\{1,3\} \cdot a\{1,3\} \subseteq (cab)\{1,3\}$;

(ii) $b^\dagger a^\dagger \in (cab)\{1,3\}$, $cab = cabb^\dagger a^\dagger ab$ *and* $ca(e - bb^\dagger)a^\dagger a(e - bb^\dagger) = ca(e - bb^\dagger)$.

Proof. Using arguments similar to the ones in the proof of Theorem 3.2, it is not difficult to prove that the first statement of the theorem is equivalent to the following equations.

$$\text{(i)}\, c_1a_1a_1^*d^\dagger c_1a_1 = c_1a_1, \qquad \text{(ii)}\, c_1a_1a_1^*d^\dagger = (c_1a_1a_1^*d^\dagger)^*,$$
$$\text{(iii)}\, c_1a_1 - c_1a_1a_1^*d^\dagger a_1 = 0, \qquad \text{(iv)}\, c_1a_1a_1^*d^\dagger a_2 = 0.$$

The first two equations are equivalent to $b^\dagger a^\dagger \in (cab)\{1,3\}$, the third to $cabb^\dagger a^\dagger ab = cab$ and the fourth to $ca(e-bb^\dagger)a^\dagger a(e-bb^\dagger) = ca(e-bb^\dagger)$. □

Theorem 3.7. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a prime ring with involution. Consider $a, b \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ and $c \in \mathcal{R}$ such that c commutes with b and b^*. Then, following statements are equivalent:*

(i) $b\{1,4\} \cdot a\{1,4\} \subseteq (abc)\{1,4\}$;

(ii) $b^\dagger a^\dagger \in (abc)\{1,4\}$, $ab = abb^\dagger a^\dagger abc$ *and* $(e-a^\dagger a)bc = (e-a^\dagger a)bb^\dagger(e-a^\dagger a)bc$.

Proof. As in Theorem 3.4, since given $x \in \mathcal{R}$, $(x\{1,4\})^* = x^*\{1,3\}$, the first statement is equivalent to $a^*\{1,3\} \cdot b^*\{1,3\} \subseteq (c^*b^*a^*)\{1,3\}$. Now apply Theorem 3.6. □

Next some characterizations of reverse order laws for K-inverses in C^*-algebras will be extended to the context of the present work.

Theorem 3.8. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a ring with involution. Consider $a, b \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ such that $ab, abb^\dagger, a(e-bb^\dagger) \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$. Let $c \in \mathcal{R}$ such that c commutes with a and a^*, $cab = ab$ and $c^*ab = ab$. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

(i) $bb^\dagger a^*ab = a^*ab$;

(ii) $b\{1,3\} \cdot a\{1,3\} \cdot c \subseteq (ab)\{1,3\}$;

(iii) $b^\dagger a^\dagger c \in (ab)\{1,3\}$;

(iv) $b^\dagger a^\dagger c \in (ab)\{1,2,3\}$.

Proof. Under the conditions of the theorem, using the matrix representations given in Remark 3.1, it is not difficult to prove that $b^\dagger a^\dagger c = b^\dagger a^\dagger$ and that necessary and sufficient condition for (ii) to holds is the fact that $b\{1,3\} \cdot a\{1,3\} \subseteq (ab)\{1,3\}$. In particular, it is enough to prove the equivalences among statements (i)-(iv) for the case $c = e$. Now, the proof of this case follows by Theorem 3.1 in Cvetković-Ilić, Harte (2011), where the same conditions of statements (i)-(iv) were considered for a, b two C^*-algebra elements and $c = e$. However, for the sake of completeness the proof of the case $c = e$ will be presented.

We will show that $(i) \Rightarrow (ii) \Rightarrow (iii) \Rightarrow (i)$ and then $(i) \Rightarrow (iv) \Rightarrow (iii)$. Note that the notation of Remark 3.1 will be used. In particular, under the hypothesis of the theorem, a_1, $a_2 \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$.

$(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$. Suppose that $bb^\dagger a^*ab = a^*ab$, which is equivalent to $a_2^*a_1 = 0$, i.e., $a_1^*a_2 = 0$. For arbitrary $a^{(1,3)}, b^{(1,3)}$ we have that

$$abb^{(1,3)}a^{(1,3)}ab = \begin{bmatrix} a_1z_1a_1b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}_{r,q}.$$

Let $s = a_1a_1^\dagger$. Since $a_1^*a_2 = 0$, $d \in s\mathcal{A}s + (e-s)\mathcal{A}(e-s)$, and then we have that $d^\dagger \in s\mathcal{A}s + (e-s)\mathcal{A}(e-s)$. Now, $a_1^*d^\dagger a_2 \in \mathcal{A}s \cdot (s\mathcal{A}s + (e-s)\mathcal{A}(e-s)) \cdot (e-s)\mathcal{A} = \{0\}$. Hence, $a_1^*d^\dagger a_2 = 0$, i.e., $a_2^*d^\dagger a_1 = 0$.

Since,

$$\begin{aligned} a_1z_1a_1 &= a_1a_1^*d^\dagger a_1 + a_1(e - a_1^*d^\dagger a_1)x_1a_1 \\ &= (d - a_2a_2^*)d^\dagger a_1 + (a_1 - (d - a_2a_2^*)d^\dagger a_1)x_1a_1 \\ &= a_1, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that $abb^{(1,3)}a^{(1,3)}ab = ab$. To prove that $abb^{(1,3)}a^{(1,3)}$ is hermitian, it is sufficient to prove that a_1z_1 is hermitian and $a_1z_2 = 0$. By computation, we get that $a_1z_1 = a_1a_1^*d^\dagger = a_1a_1^*(a_1a_1^*)^\dagger$ which is hermitian. Also,

$$\begin{aligned} a_1z_2 &= (a_1 - a_1a_1^*d^\dagger a_1)x_2 - a_1a_1^*d^\dagger a_2x_4 \\ &= (a_1 - (d - a_2a_2^*)d^\dagger a_1)x_2 = \\ &= a_2a_2^*d^\dagger a_1x_2 \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

$(ii) \Rightarrow (iii)$. This is evident.

$(iii) \Rightarrow (i)$. From $abb^\dagger a^\dagger ab = ab$ it follows that $a_1a_1^*d^\dagger a_1 = a_1$, i.e., $a_2a_2^*d^\dagger a_1 = 0$. Similarly, from $(abb^\dagger a^\dagger)^* = abb^\dagger a^\dagger$, we get that $a_1a_1^*d^\dagger$ is hermitian. Now, $d^\dagger a_1a_1^*a_1 = a_1$, i.e., $a_2a_2^*a_1 = 0$. Multiplying the last equality by $a_2^\dagger$ from the left, we get $a_2^*a_1 = 0$, which is equivalent to statement (i).

$(iv) \Rightarrow (iii)$. This is obvious.

$(i) \Rightarrow (iv)$. We need to prove that $b^\dagger a^\dagger abb^\dagger a^\dagger = b^\dagger a^\dagger$, which is equivalent to $b^\dagger a_1^*d^\dagger a_1a_1^*d^\dagger = b^\dagger a_1^*d^\dagger$. The last equality follows from the fact that $d^\dagger a_1a_1^* = s$. □

Theorem 3.9. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a ring with involution. Consider $a, b \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ such that $ab, a^\dagger ab, (e - a^\dagger a)b \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$. Let $c \in \mathcal{R}$ such that c commutes with b and b^*, $abc = ab$ and $abc^* = ab$. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

(i) $abb^*a^\dagger a = abb^*$;

(ii) $c \cdot b\{1,4\} \cdot a\{1,4\} \subseteq (ab)\{1,4\}$;

(iii) $cb^\dagger a^\dagger \in (ab)\{1,4\}$;

(iv) $cb^\dagger a^\dagger \in (ab)\{1,2,4\}$.

Proof. Apply Theorem 3.8 to b^* and a^* using that $x^*\{1,3\} = (x\{1,4\})^*$ and $x^*\{1,2,3\} = (x\{1,2,4\})^*$, $x \in \mathcal{R}$. □

Remark 3.10. Since the results of this section apply to prime rings with involution, some of the most relevant examples of these objects will be considered.

It is not difficult to prove that a commutative prime ring is just an integral domain. In addition, given $\mathcal{R}$ a ring with unit element, if $\mathcal{R}^{n\times n}$ is the ring of all matrices of order $n \in \mathbb{N}$

with elements in $\mathcal{R}$, then according to Theorem 8 in McCoy (1949), necessary and sufficient for $\mathcal{R}^{n\times n}$ to be prime is that $\mathcal{R}$ is prime. Therefore, if $\mathcal{R}$ is an integral domain and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{R}^{n\times n}$ with the transpose is a prime ring with involution.

In the context of Banach algebras, as it has been mentioned in section 1, every algebra of operators which contains the ideal of all finite rank operators is easily seen to be prime, in particular $L(H)$, the algebra of all bounded and linear maps defined on the Hilbert space H, is a prime ring with involution. Moreover, if $K(H)$ is the closed ideal of all compact operators defined on the Hilbert space H, then according to Proposition 2.4 in Mathieu (1988), $\mathcal{C}(H) = L(H)/K(H)$, the Calkin algebra of H, is a prime ring with involution. Naturally, $L(H)$ and $\mathcal{C}(H)$ are prime C^*-algebras. Concerning C^*-algebras, in general prime C^*-algebras are not commutative. In fact, if $A = C([0,1])$, then it is not difficult to define two continuous functions f, $g \in C([0,1])$, such that $fg = 0$. On the other hand, prime C^*-algebras were characterized in terms of the norm of elementary operators, the spectrum of elementary operators, and the Taylor joint spectrum of left and right multiplication operators, see Proposition 2.3 in Matieu (1989) and Theorem 2 and Corollary 3 in Curto, Hernández (1997).

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to express their indebtedness to the referee, for his observations and suggestions considerably improved the final version of the present article.

References

Baksalary J. K., Baksalary O. M. (2005). An invariance property related to the reverse order law. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 410: 64–69.

Boasso E. (2006). On the Moore-Penrose inverse in C^*-algebras. *Extracta Math.* 21: 93-106.

Curto R. E., Hernández G. C. (1997). A joint spectral characterization of primeness for C^*-algebras. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 125: 3299-3301.

Cvetković-Ilić D. S., Harte R. E. (2011). Reverse order laws in C*-algebras. *Linear Alg. Appl.* 434: 1388-1394.

Greville T. N. E. (1966). Note on the generalized inverse of a matrix product. *SIAM Rev.* 8: 518-521.

Harte R. E., Mbekhta M. (1992). On generalized inverses in C^*-algebras. *Studia Math.* 103: 71-77.

Harte R., Hernández C. (1998). On the Taylor spectrum of left-right multipliers. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 126: 397-404.

Koliha J. J., Patrício P. (2002). Elements of rings with equal spectral idempotents. *J. Aust. Math. Soc.* 72: 137-152.

Koliha J. J., Djordjević D. S., Cvetković D. S. (2007). Moore-Penrose inverse in rings with involution. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 426: 371-381.

Mathieu M. (1988). Elementary operators on prime C^*-algebras II. *Glasg. Math. J.* 30: 275-284.

Mathieu M. (1989). Elementary operators on prime C^*-algebras I. *Math. Ann.* 284: 223-244.

McCoy N. H. (1949). Prime ideals in general rings. *Amer. J. Math.* 71: 823-833.

Moore E. H. (1920). On the reciprocal of the general algebraic matrix. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 26: 394-395.

Mosić D., Djordjević D. S. (2009). Moore-Penrose-invertible normal and hermitian elements in rings. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 431: 732-745.
Penrose R. (1955). A generalized inverse for matrices. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 51: 406-413.
Roch S., Silbermann B. (1999). Continuity of generalized inverses in Banach algebras. *Studia Math.* 136: 197-227.

Enrico Boasso
E-mail: enrico_odisseo@yahoo.it